PATENT

REMARKS

The above amendments and these remarks are submitted in reply to the Office Action dated March 25, 2004.

Summary of the Examiner's Objections/Rejections

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Martinez (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,757). Claims 3-4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if re-written in independent form.

Summary of the Applicants Amendments

Figure 1 has been amended to make the illustration thereof coincide with the originally filed specification. The specification has been amended to correct minor grammatical and typographical errors present therein. Claims 1, 3 and 6-9 have been amended. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by such amendments.

Rejection of Claims 1-12

The Applicant traverses the rejection of the aforementioned claims for the reasons set forth in greater detail below. The present invention is directed, for example, to a thin-client Internet launching system which may provide a secure and effort-free mechanism for a user to retrieve new, updated, or otherwise not currently loaded information or software on a user or client system. As defined in Claim 1, the novel method employs an Internet agent (which is part of the BIOS) that is operative to:

"...add a predetermined number of Multipurpose Internet Mail Extension (MIME) headers to the registry that identify the user computer systems..."

"...transfer the MIME headers in Hyper Text Transfer Protocol (HTTP) request to the server computer..."

which results in:

"...receiving service content from the service computer is the MIME headers were transferred..."

9

None of the aforementioned limitations or the advantageous results provided thereby is disclosed in the cited reference. Consequently, Martinez does not anticipate the invention as defined in Claim 1. Additionally, in rejecting the above-noted claim, the Examiner has appeared to ignore the aforementioned claim limitations and has misstated where such limitations are discussed in Martinez. Thus, the rejection of the aforementioned claims is improper and should be withdrawn.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner indicates, for example, on page 2, paragraph 2 that "...adding a predetermined number of Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) headers to the registry that identify the user computer system..." and "...transferring the MIME headers in a Hyper Text Transfer Protocol (HTTP) request to the server computer..." are disclosed at col. 2, lines 7-59 of Martinez. However, a fair reading of that section of Martinez does not reveal a discussion of MIME headers, their use or placement in the registry of a user (or client) computer and the transferring of the same in a HTTP request. In fact, MIME headers are not disclosed in that section, or in any portion of Martinez. Thus, at least the aforementioned limitations of Claim 1 are not disclosed in Martinez.

As understood, Martinez is directed to a method where a headless server receives updated BIOS code by a client machine pushing the same to a special portion (e.g. Service Partition) of the memory (see, for example, col. 2, line 52 – col. 3, line 19) and then booting the headless server from the Server Partition (see, for example, col. 3, lines 23-30). There does not appear to be a discussion of the headless server altering its registry (via the MIME headers) to identify itself as a particular type of server or device, nor does there appear to be a discussion of "...transferring the MIME headers in a ...HTTP request to the server computer..." as it is the server computer in Martinez that is providing the updated code. Consequently, as Martinez does not appear to disclose or even suggest the steps recited in Claim 1, the Applicant submits that Martinez does not disclose each and every limitation of Claim 1 as required by 35 U.S.C. §102. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Moreover, the Examiner has not provided Applicant with a pointer as to where within Martinez the aforementioned limitations are discussed. If the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's assertion that MIME headers and their use in modifying the registry

10

PATENT

is not present within Martinez, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide the Applicant with such a showing in a subsequent, non-final Office Action.

Claims 2-4 depend upon and include all the limitations of Claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1-4 is respectfully requested.

The inappropriateness of the form of rejection as provided by the Examiner as outlined above with respect to Claim 1 is equally applicable to the rejection of Claim 5 and is incorporated in its entirely herein. Moreover, this claim is not anticipated by the cited reference as Martinez does not disclose each of the limitations of such claim as required by 35 U.S.C. §102. Thus, Claim 5 is not anticipated by Martinez. Claim 5 is directed to a computer system including one or more user computer system having BIOS that includes:

> "...an Internet agent that...functions to add a predetermined number of Multipurpose Internet Mail Extension (MIME) headers to the registry to identify the respective user computer system, and that changes a default web page of the web browser of the respective use computer system to point to a web page on the server computer..."

that results in service content from a server being received by the one or more user computers. As such, Claim 5, like Claim 1 above, includes a limitations directed to an Internet Agent that modifies the registry of the corresponding computer system by adding a number of MIME headers thereto. Consequently, Claim 5 is submitted to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 5 is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-8 depend upon and include all the limitations of Claim 5 and are submitted to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 5. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 5-8 is respectfully requested.

The inappropriateness of the form of rejection as provided by the Examiner as outlined above with respect to Claim 1 is equally applicable to the rejection of Claim 9 and is incorporated in its entirely herein. Moreover, this claim is not anticipated by the cited reference as Martinez does not disclose each of the limitations of such claim as required by 35 U.S.C. §102. Thus, Claim 9 is not anticipated by Martinez. Claim 9, like

11

PATENT

Claim 5 above, is directed to a computer system including one or more user computers having a web browser, where each user computer includes a BIOS having:

> "...an Internet agent...that functions to add a predetermined number of Multipurpose Internet Mail Extension (MIME) headers to the registry to identify the respective user computer system, and that changes a default web page of the web browser of the respective user computer to point to a web page on the server computer..."

As such, Claim 9 is submitted to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 5. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 0-12 depend upon and include the limitations of Claim 9 and are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 9. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 9-12 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-12 are now in proper condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayments or credit any over payments to Deposit Account No. 16-1520 for any payment in connection with this communication, including any fees for extension of time, which may be required. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if such action might expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
PHOENIX TECHNOLOGIES LTD.

Date: ___9|27/04___   By: _____
                                  Loren H. McRoss
                                  Registration No. 40,427

915 Murphy Ranch Road
Milpitas, CA 95035
PH: (408) 570-1000
FX: (408) 570-1044

12